



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,153	10/14/2004	Kazuhiro Murata	0234-0477PUS1	9026
2292	7590	10/06/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				ROLLAND, ALEX A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/06/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/511,153	MURATA, KAZUHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALEX ROLLAND	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

1. By amendment filed 7/25/08, claims 2-3 have been cancelled, claims 4-6 have been added, and claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1, 4-6 are currently pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 4 objected to because of the following informalities: in lines 4 and 5 "melting" condition is believed to refer to, and should be replaced with, "melted" condition; line 4 recites viscosity units of "mPa•S" and should be replaced with the more conventional units of "mPa•s". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 and 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takagami et al (JP 2000-340928).

Takagami et al teaches a printed circuit board production method comprising: printing a melted thermofusion solid ink comprising wax onto an insulating substrate and leaving portions corresponding to an image unsprayed ([0020], [0023], [0026], and Fig. 1); coating the insulating substrate with a conductive layer ([0026]-[0027]); and removing

the solid ink by solving [0025]; wherein resist image is applied in accordance with data from a computer [0012].

With respect to claim 5, the solid ink is melted with thermal energy just before printing [0023].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagami et al (JP 2000-340928) in view of Schwarz et al (US 5006170).

Takagami et al is discussed above but fails to teach the specific properties of the wax based solid ink including melting point, surface tension, and viscosity. However, Schwarz et al teaches a hot melt ink composition that mainly comprises a wax based binder and has a melting point from about 60 to about 150°C, a surface tension from about 20 to about 65 dynes per centimeter (20-65 mN/m), and a viscosity from about 1 to about 10 centipoise (1-10 mPa•s). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the method of Takagami et al using the wax based ink composition of Schwarz et al because Schwarz et al states

that said wax based ink composition having specific properties is especial suitable for ink jet printing.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagami et al (JP 2000-340928) in view of Reeb (US 4935093).

Takagami discussed above but fails to teach a step for removing oil adhered in an offset drum process. However, Reeb teaches a method for producing printed circuit boards (col. 16, line 56) wherein residual silicon oil from an offset drum process (col. 46, lines 5-7, and Fig. 13) may be removed from the surface of the PW (production web) by means of a cleaning station (col. 46, lines 9-10) and it is desirable to do so because residual oils inhibit affixation of the resist layer onto the substrate (col. 16, lines 63-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the printed circuit board production method of Takagami et al with the method of producing printed circuit boards of Reeb because Reeb states that resist layers should exhibit a high affixation to the substrate and cleaning the substrate of residual oils aids in affixation.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., (i) not requiring an etching step, (ii) not forming a resist, and (iii) forming a

microscopic circuit pattern at high speed while ensuring flexibility/freedom in designing circuit print) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

9. No Claims are allowed. All pending claims are rejected for the reasons set forth above.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEX ROLLAND whose telephone number is (571)270-5355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on (571)272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ALEX ROLLAND/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Michael Cleveland/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792